



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES ON SEMITIC GRAMMAR.

BY PROFESSOR MAX L. MARGOLIS,

Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, O.

II.

THE FEMININE ENDING *T* IN HEBREW.

In the current Hebrew grammars (Olshausen, § 109; Bickell-Curtiss, § 92; Stade, § 308; Gesenius-Kautzsch, 25th ed., § 80, 2b) we are informed that feminine nouns in Hebrew, so far as the gender is indicated by a distinct formative element, end either in AT or simple T, *e. g.*, הַכְּמָה construct state הַכְּמַת = ḥakam + at, אֵילָה cstr. אֵילַת = 'aṣṣal + t. Whatever the mutual relation of the two terminations may be, namely, whether T be a modification ("eine Abart") of AT or not, it is acceded that both stand on an equal footing, and that they existed alongside of each other in the earliest speech of the Hebrews: the one is vocalic and accented, the other consonantal and unaccented. We are then told that the toneless termination is "especially frequent with participles and infinitives" and that the cstr. st. and the forms with suffixes show a predilection for the shorter accretion, *e. g.*, יִלְדָּה Jer. 22:23 and יִלְדָּת *ibid.* 31:8, cstr. יִלְדַת *ibid.* 15:9, with suff. יוֹלְדָתָהּ Prov. 23:25, יוֹלְדָתוֹ *ibid.* 17:25, יוֹלְדָתָהּ Cant. 6:9, יוֹלְדָתְכֶם Jer. 50:12. The plural, they tell us, is formed from the longer ending, even where the latter does not happen to be found in the Old Testament literature (*e. g.*, מִיִּלְדָּת *Ex.* 1:19, pl. מִיִּלְדָּת *ibid.* from *מִיִּלְדָּת).

I ask myself the following question: Why is it that, while we find הַכְּמָה 2 Sam. 20:16, cstr. הַכְּמַת *Ex.* 35:25, and עֲקָרָה Deut. 7:14, cstr. עֲקָרָה Ps. 113:9, with suff. צִדְקָתָּה Gen. 30:33 (from צִדְקָה *ibid.* 15:6) and בְּהִמָּתָה *Ex.* 20:10 (from בְּהִמָּה *ibid.* 20:13, cstr. בְּהִמָּה Deut. 28:26), we have no choice in the case of forms like יִלְדָּה, אֵילָה, מִמְלָכָה which have in the const. st. almost invariably יִלְדַת, אֵילַת, מִמְלַכַת, and forms like *יִלְדָתוֹ, *אֵילָתוֹ,

מִמְלַכְתּוֹ would be regarded by any Hebraist as ungrammatical? The *obligatory* use of יְלֻדְתָּי, etc., forms, it seems to me, cannot be *accidental*.

I turn to Aramaic and find there not only an analogous phenomenon, but I think also the key to an adequate solution of the problem.

THE ARAMAIC SYSTEM OF NOMINAL INFLECTION

appears to me simple and consistent throughout.

I group Aramaic nouns as (1) *bi*-, (2) *tri*-, (3) *pluriliteral*.

BILITERALS.

The general type of a biliteral noun is *cvc*, *i. e.*, so far as the stem is concerned, the noun consists of two consonants and one intervening vowel. The latter may be short or long; the second consonant simple or doubled. Examples of a long vowel followed by a doubled consonant are wanting, in fact impossible from a Semitic point of view (*cf.* Bickell-Curtiss, § 38; עֲלִין Dan. 4:5; 5:8 Qerē for עֲלִין = עֲלִין, עֲלִין Deut. 4:5 quoted by Dalman, *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch*, 274, אֲרַמַּיִשׁ Noeldeke, *Syrische Grammatik*, § 178 B, are only seeming exceptions which will find an explanation below, p. 208, 24). Hence we find the following three types: (a) *cvc*, (b) *cvc̄*, (c) *cvc̄c̄*. These are at the same time the forms of the absol. and cstr. st. sing., only that in the third case, since the second consonant is vowelless, its doubling is only potential, not actual. *E. g.*,

I. a. בַּר צִי b. נֹר נִי c. לֵב כֵּב

All the other forms in the inflection are derived from I. by inflectional accretions or by the addition of an element the complete union of which with the stem is marked by the presence after the final radical of a *full* or *reduced* vowel (*e. g.*, נֹרָא Dan. 3:6, רִיחָא 5:20, כְּלֵהוֹן 2:38 = koḷēhōn).

This fact itself requires an explanation, *i. e.*, it must be understood as the result of a certain principle. The following observations are intended to show that the latter cannot be *formative*, but must be *phonetic*.

The Arabic system of nominal inflection, notably in its case endings, the inflectional differentiation of the two states, the

formation of the *pluralis sanus*, the manner in which the pronominal suffixes are appended, is claimed by some scholars to be identical with the Protosemitic system, while according to others it is an expansion thereof. The question is certainly an open one. But even admitting the view mentioned in the second place to be the correct one, we may safely take the Arabic system as an index to the more ancient method. Leaving aside roots terminating in a semivowel (where, however, the changes effected in the stem are due to the nature of the latter and not to the inflectional elements *per se*), we may observe that (except in some cases to be mentioned soon) the inflectional accretions leave the nominal stem in its original form. This is best seen in the forms with suffixes. $\text{يَدِي} = \text{يَد} + \text{ي}$, $\text{يَدَيْكُم} = \text{يَد} + \text{كُم}$. The final stem (or case) vowel always remains; it may even influence the character of the vowel contained in the pronominal element (ا for ا, when preceded by *i*); only once it is seemingly influenced by the consonant with which the suffix commences (ي, *i. e.*, ي in all three cases; which simply means that the genitive has here taken the place of the other cases). Thus the nominal stem (including its final vowel) suffers no change throughout the inflection, *i. e.*, the principle of inflection is not *phonetic*, but *formative*. To take the forms with suffixes, it can be shown that the same method of appending them to the stem is applied both in Aramaic and Arabic. Compare $\text{יִידִיכֹן} = \text{כֹן} + \text{יִידִי}$ and $\text{אַבְרָהָם} = \text{רֹן} + \text{אַבְרָהָם}$ Dalman, 160, 157, with يَدَيْكُم , أَبُوهُمْ . The suffixes in רִיחִי (see above) = *rūḥihī*, יִידָהֻם Ezr. 5:8 = *yidahum* are exactly the same as in رُوحِهِمْ , يَدَهُمْ . Thus the *formative* principle is the identical one in both examples: hence the preservation of the final stem-vowel in one and its partial loss in the other must be explained on *purely phonetic* grounds.

The fact before us is that a Semitic (Arabic) vowel in the same position is retained in the Aramaic in one form and wholly or partly dropped in another. It is well known that Arabic *long* vowels remain in Aramaic, *cf.*, *e. g.*, $\text{وَاتِب} = \text{יִתִּיב}$ Dalman, 256 = مُتَاب . Only *short* vowels are subject to total or partial decay,

cf. $\text{וְאַתִּיבִּין} = \text{יְהִיבִין}$ Ezr. 4:17 = יְהִיבִין . What are then the conditions which render this decay possible, often necessary? *Syllabic* conditions, in the first place. Short vowels in closed syllables remain, cf. מֶרְקָב , מֶרְקָבָא Dalman, 133. It is only in open syllables that a short vowel *may* be reduced or else disappear entirely. A second factor is apparently required to determine whether a short vowel in an open syllable *shall* remain or not. This factor, it seems to me, is *accentual*. A comparison of Arabic كَاتِبِينَ with Bibl. Aram. כְּתִיבִין (יְהִיבִין), Targūmic כְּתִיבִין (יְהִיבִין , Merx, *Chrestomathia*, 109, 3) and modern Arabic *kāṭibīn* (Spitta, § 70 b) on the one hand and Syriac ܟܬܝܒܝܢ (this the ordinary form; occasional forms like ܟܬܝܒܝܢ occur, Noeldeke, *loc. cit.*, 16, footnote) on the other should teach us, in the first place, that, before a vowel is allowed to disappear entirely, it passes through a stage at which it is articulated unemphatically, indistinctly (*is reduced*, we say), and, secondly, that the cause of this unemphatic articulation is *absence of stress*. In وְאַתִּיבִּין the word-accent falls on the penult (Caspari-Mueller, 5th ed., § 30); modern Arabic *kāṭibīn* (Spitta, § 25 a, 1) indeed points to just such an accentuation; hence the (main) accent in יְהִיבִין stands presumably where it stood originally. Spitta (§ 24) informs us that in reading Arabic we ought to pay attention also to secondary accents; יְהִיבִין has a secondary accent (on the first syllable). We may at once infer that Arabic وְאַתִּיבִּין should be properly pronounced with two stresses, *wátibīna* (leaving it for the present undecided as to which of the two was originally the principal accent); this was certainly the *Aramaic* pronunciation of the word. The syllable TI was thus never accented in Aramaic, and consequently its vowel liable to a less emphatic articulation. A short [Semitic, Arabic] vowel in an open syllable, we can speak now with precision, will remain in Aramaic if stressed, but will be slurred or passed over rapidly and eventually cease to be articulated altogether if unaccented. We may point to similar facts in other languages. Cf. in Greek ἐπτόμην by the side of πέτομαι , ἔδρακον || δέρκομαι , πατρῶν || πατέρες (Brugmann, "Griechische Grammatik" [in

Iwan Müller's *Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft*, II., 2d ed.], § 24: "die Tiefstufenformen waren durch Vokalreduktion infolge der Hochtonigkeit der folgenden Silbe entsprungen"); in Latin VALDE by the side of VALIDUS, FERCULUM || FERICULUM, AGMEN || *AGIMEN, PROPTER || *PROPITER (Stolz-Schmalz, "Lateinische Grammatik" [*ibid.*], § 74). In our own language the initial *a* in "America" is in familiar speech seldom given its full sound; I should transcribe it by \equiv , were I to use a Hebrew symbol; note the full sound which the accented *a* has in the word "Italian" and its indistinctness when unaccented, as in the word "Italy."

רִיחִיָּה, so much we can see now, kept a full vowel after the second radical because that vowel was the bearer of an accent, while in כְּלִיָּהוּ the vowel in the same position was reduced because it was not accented. But what were the principles of Early Aramaic accentuation? How, in the first place, shall we get at them? By induction, I answer with Lagarde (*Übersicht über die . . . Bildung der Nomina*, 153, 4 sqq.). The nominal forms with which we are concerned at present offer the following suggestions:

1. רִיחִיָּה = rūḥihī = rūḥihī (cf. אֲבִיָּהוּ Dan. 5:2) and its like compared with כְּלִיָּהוּ = kulīhum remind us on the one hand that in the suffixes we possess originally self-existent words which, in order to give up their independent existence, had first to lose that which marks the separate existence of a word, *i. e.*, stress, and be reduced to the level of enclitics (cf. ὁ πατήρ μου), and on the other that, when stronger motives came into play, however close the union may have been between the dominant noun and the pronominal element, the tendency towards enclisis was overcome and the suffix kept its own accent, though it may have been subordinate to the main accent within the nominal stem. It seems that all the suffixes except those which at present terminate in a consonant consisted originally of one (open) syllable with (probably) a long vowel; while עַ , סַ , אֵ , אִ (cf. Arabic كُمْ, كُنْ, هُمْ, هُنَّ and occasional forms in Hebrew, as, e.g., בְּיַחֲדִיָּהוּ Ezek. 1:11, זְמַחֲנָה *ibid.* 23:48, 49, נִסְחָתִיכָה *ibid.* 13:20) point to an originally dissyllabic form. The changes

which the two kinds of suffixes undergo in the various dialects (with the monosyllabic suffixes shortening of the vowel, *rūḥihī, cf. **רוּחֵהּ**, its subsequent disappearance, **רוּחֵהּ**, and, in Talmūdic and Mandaic, dropping of the initial breathing, cf. Noeldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik*, 68 sq.; with the dissyllabic suffixes loss of the final vowel, **פְּלִהוֹן**, and, only in Talmūdic, disappearance of the second consonant, cf. Noeldeke, *loc. cit.* 180, note 1) prove that in Early Aramaic the open suffixes (those consisting of an open syllable) were enclitics, while the closed ones had at least a weak, subordinate stress.

2. The length or duration of a syllable seems to have mainly determined the position of the accent in Early Aramaic. The Aramaic accentuation was therefore *rhythmic* or *quantitative*.

יֵדָא = יֵדָא, **רוּחֵהּ** = רוּחֵהּ, **בַּנִּין** = **בַּנִּין** (the pausal of **יֵדָא**, Vernier, I., § 127), **נִרְאָ** = **נִרְאָ** prove the following to have been the rules of Early Aramaic accentuation (of nouns):

I. Of two syllables of equal duration (open syll. with a short vowel = open syll. with a short vowel; open syll. with a long vowel = open syll. with a long vowel = closed syll. with a short vowel; c v = c v; c \bar{v} = c \bar{v} = c v c) the first was accented. Hence **נִרְאָ** = **נִרְאָ** = nūrā.

II. Of two syllables of unequal duration (c v < c \bar{v} = c v c) the longer syll. was stressed. Hence **יֵדָא** = **יֵדָא** = yadā.

III. The distance between two full stresses in one word had to amount to one syllable, and to one syllable only. Hence **בַּנִּין** = **בַּנִּין** = banīna, **רוּחֵהּ** = **רוּחֵהּ** = rūḥīna.

3. It follows from the very nature and meaning of the term "enclisis," and for words consisting of two syllables (in addition to the enclitic element) also from Rule III., that the syllable immediately preceding the suffix must be the bearer of an accent. Hence **בִּיהַ** Dan. 3:7 = bīhī, **יָדִיהַ** *ibid.* 4:32 = yadīhī, **רוּחֵהַ** = rūḥīhī. From Rule II. we may learn to understand **לָהֶם** Ezr. 5:3 as lahúm; while Rule III. again teaches that **יָדִיהֶם** will have been pronounced yidahúm, **כָּלָהֶם**—kúlahúm.

4. In the case of two *long* syllables preceding the enclitic, it seems to me that the main accent rested on the first, while the second (the one immediately preceding the suffix) was the bearer of a secondary accent thrown upon it by the enclitic, the enclitic accent, we may say for short. Thus דִּינָאִיקָא = *dīnaika*. Similarly *dīnina* will have been pronounced *dīnīna*, and *dīnā*—*dīnā*. In the subsequent development of the language (*e. g.*, Bibl. Aram.) the main and secondary accents change places. Hence the accentuation רִיחָא , רִיחָא , רִיחָא = *rūhāh*, *rūhā*, *‘irīn*. (A similar process has taken place in modern Arabic with reference to the classical language; Spitta, § 24.) A slight stress will have been given to the middle syllable in בְּחֻנְךָ ; in this word as well as in פְּלִדְוֹן the first of the two full stresses was probably originally the stronger accent, here also, it seems, the reverse of the later usage.

The derived forms (above, p. 198, 26–30) thus group themselves under two heads:

- II. a. בְּרִיָּה עֲבָר b. נִדְרָא נִדְרָא c. לְבִי חָצָר
 III. יִדְרָם חֻנְךָ $\text{רִאשְׁדְּוֹן בְּחֻנְךָ}$ פְּלִדְוֹן חֻנְךָ

NOTE.—Syriac عَبْر for בְּרִיָּה Dalman, 158, teaches us that, where the vowel of the accretion was dropped, the stem-vowel was bound to reappear in its fullness. It goes without saying that for a long vowel to be dropped, it had first to go through a process of shortening; *cf.* indeed رَبِّ for رَبِّي (Caspari, § 315, rem. b). Similarly a short vowel in an inflectional accretion would remain, as long as it was followed by a consonant, and would be dropped only when it lost its consonantal companion. דַּן Dan. 5:5 as a construct state form is at once intelligible, *cf.* יָד = *yād u* (Accent Rule I.). יָד as an absol. st. form is derivable from יָד only through יָד . יָד is a possible absol. st. form; it is the usual form in poetry or rhymed prose in the rhyme (Vernier, I., § 126); the next step is يَد , the usual pausal form (*ibid.*). Hence יָד as an absol. st. form is properly a pausal form. יָד in

its origin is perfectly analogous to יִדְהֶם: the stem-vowel reappears in both, in the one through the reduction of the case-vowel, in the other through its total disappearance. Hence I. is a special case of III.: the principle is the same.—In II. it may also happen that the reduced (stem-) vowel is lost completely. By the side of מִכָּן we find אֲמַנָּן (Noeldeke, *Syr.*, § 146), אֲרַמְנָא, אֲרַמְיָא (Dalman, 161). Arabic اِسْمٌ, اِسْتٌ, اِبْنٌ become now intelligible, and it requires but little effort to identify اِسْمٌ Noeldeke, *ibid.* אֲרַמְנָא Dalman, 160, with *اَيْدٍ = modern Arabic id (Noeldeke, *Mand.*, 97).

FEMININE NOUNS.—It will be easily seen that, in the inflection of feminines of this class, the absol. and cstr. st. forms follow II., e. g., שְׁנֵי חָן = שְׁנֵי חָן = sanātu; שְׁנֵי חָן; שְׁנֵי חָן. So also all forms in the plural, inasmuch as the second radical is followed by a full vowel (the long vowel of the plural endings ān, āt): חָן, חָן, חָן, etc. The emphatic st. sing. and all forms of the sing. with suffixes which have a full vowel after the τ (*i. e.*, all forms with open suffixes) come evidently under III. Hence:

III. a. אֲמַנָּא b. עֲקָתָא c. מִלְתָּה

In all the examples given under III. (here and above) the vowel following the second radical, as may be seen from the rukāḳ in Syriac and the indispensable mēteg (Stade, § 52 a) in Bibl. Aram. (רִאשֹׁהֹן Kautzsch, § 9, rem. 4 c; עֲקָתָא = עֲקָתָא Dalman, 55 sq.) is not wholly lost. Elsewhere its articulation may be dispensed with entirely, e. g., מִנָּן = שְׁנֵי Dalman, 161; בִּירְתָּא Ezr. 6:2, ed. Baer (the mēteg serves here the same purpose as in שְׁתִּלְי Stade, § 52 b; Kautzsch, *ibid.*, speaks of an “abnormity”!) or, since in Semitic a long vowel was not tolerated in a closed syllable (above, p. 198, 16), with shortened stem-vowel שְׁתִּלְי Dan. 3:6 in the common edit., for which שְׁתִּלְי ed. Baer is a variant analogous to מִלְתָּה in Hebrew, Ps. 88:7, from the sing. מִלְתָּה Isa. 29:15; in the case of c the total loss of the final stem-vowel would render the doubling of the second radical impossible and reduce the form to the level of one of type a (*cf.* Mandaic בִּירְתָּא Noeldeke, 103, inferring the pronunciation from the spelling). Interesting is the reverse. To prevent the total loss of the final

I. a.	חָ	b.	חָ	c.	חָב
II.	חָא		חָא		חָא
III.	חָא, אָחָא		חָא		חָא
	חָא		חָא		
IV.	חָא, חָא		חָא, חָא		חָא
	חָא, חָא		חָא		

Note *ad* II. a אָחָא; *ad* III. b חָא—a back-formation from חָא.

If we reconstruct the oldest inflection of biliteral nouns in Aramaic, we obtain the following table (by omitting חָא and חָא as inconsistent with the Semitic phonetic law referred to above (p. 204, 27), and as coming from a time when the quantitative distinction of vowels was no longer felt):

I. a.	אָחָא יָדָא יָדָא	b.	חָא	חָא	c.	חָא	חָא
II.	חָא, חָא		חָא	חָא		חָא	חָא
	חָא		חָא	חָא		חָא	חָא
IV.	חָא, חָא		חָא, חָא		חָא, חָא		חָא
	חָא, חָא		חָא		חָא		

Note חָא = חָא pausal form of חָא Vernier, I., § 129

TRILITERALS.

The general type of a trilateral noun is *cvcvc* (the number of vowels follows from the Semitic laws of syllabication: 1. All syllables begin in a consonant, and in one consonant only—*cvc* impossible; 2. A syllable may end in a consonant, but in one consonant only—*cvc* impossible). The middle consonant may be simple or doubled: *cvcvc* or *cvc̣vc*. The vowels may be both short or both long, or one short and the other long: *cvcvc*, *c̄vc̄vc*, *c̄vcvc*, *cvc̄vc*. For purposes of inflection (since a vowel preceding a doubled consonant is immutable) *cvc̄vc* will come under the class *c̄vc̄vc* or *c̄vcvc* according as the second vowel is long or short.

FIRST CLASS: c v c v c:

I.	חָבֵב		עֵבֶד	
II.	סַנְבָּלָא	הִרְבָּא	עֲדָפָא	מִלְכָּא
III.	חֲבַפְפִּי	אֲזַבְּנִי	מִלְכִּכֹּן	אַרְעִדֹן
	יִנְפִּלָּא	נִשְׁמִתָּךְ	נִמְסַבָּא	חֲפִדָּא
IV.		נִכְסְתִדֹּן	חֲפִדֹּן (= חָפֵד)	

NOTES.—II. In Bibl. Aram. the following may be observed: with all such nouns as retain in Hebrew their dissyllabic character, the third radical, if one of the letters בגדכפת, is aspirated, *i. e.*, to use a term current in some Hebrew grammars, the first syllable is loosely closed; while with nouns corresponding to Hebrew monosyllables (“segolates”) it is firmly closed. This distinction disappears in the plural where the first syllable is always loosely closed. The larger meaning of this statement I hope to set forth in a future paper on “The Hebrew-Aramaic Plural.” In Syriac the first syllable is firmly closed in the sing. and plur. of both classes of nouns. Traces of the older (=Bibl. Aram.) method are still discernible in Syriac, inasmuch as occasional examples of aspiration are limited in the case of the “segolates” to the plural, while with other nouns of the trilateral class they are also found in the sing., *e. g.*, חֲפָא pl. חֲפִי (Heb. אֶלֶף, חֲפָא) Noel-deke, 58 sq.—III. In addition to the methods given in the table, Syriac and Targūmic present a third possibility. I refer to forms like חֲפִי, חֲפִי, חֲפִי, חֲפִי, etc., *i. e.*, חֲפִי, חֲפִי, etc., with the חֲפִי (Duval, *Grammaire Syriacque*, 125 sqq.; Merx, *Syr.*, 76 sqq.), אֲרִיכֹן Dalman, 164. This proves that at a later epoch the first syllable came to be considered as originally closed, on a line with the first syllable in words like חֲפִי, and its vowel as immutable, so that, in order to facilitate the pronunciation, it was found necessary to insert a vowel most probably resembling the preceding vowel, though much influenced by the character of the consonant immediately following it. אֲזַבִּי Noel-deke, 62, is a direct descendant of אֲרִיכֹן. As no one will contend that אֲזַבִּי is a “Hebraism,” we may take מִלְכָּא Dan. 2:10, חֲפִי *ibid.* 4:2, אֲבִי, צִיִּים, צִיִּים (Merx, *Chrest.*, cf. the

glossary) as good Aramaic forms, descendants of *מִלְכִּכּוֹן, etc., exactly as מִלְכִּכּוֹן, in its turn, gave rise to מִלְכָּא. From a comparison of מִלְכָּא with מִלְכָּא, of חֲסֵר with חֲסֵר, it would follow that, in the older method, the reappearing vowel was indeed the original vowel (the second vowel of the stem). How far this inference is true, when all examples are collected, remains to be seen. At any rate I. is no more than a special case of III.—It will be readily seen that the principles of Early Aramaic accentuation as stated above with reference to biliteral nouns are here equally at work, and that I.–III. here exactly correspond to II.–IV. there (above, p. 206, 1–6). In IV. we have an increment of one syllable; the accentuation is in full accord with the rules laid down above.

SECOND CLASS: $c \bar{v} c \bar{v} c$ [$c v \check{c} \bar{v} c$]. There is nothing of importance to be said of this class, inasmuch as long [immutable] vowels suffer no visible change on account of the shifting of the accent.

THIRD CLASS: $c \bar{v} c v c$ [$c v \check{c} v c$]:

I.	חֲכָר	עֲלָם	עֲבָר	אֲרָר
II.	חֲכָרָא	עֲלָמָא	עֲבָרָא	אֲרָרָא
III.	חֲכַכְבָּר	אֲחָבָר	אֲחָבָר	יִקְרָא
IV.	חֲכַכְבָּרָא			

NOTES.—I. עֲבָר compared with עֲבָר shows the force of the long vowel (I. here also a special case of III!).—II. עֲבָרָא! Observe the mètèg! Syriac חֲכָר is on a line with חֲכַכְבָּר, and must be judged accordingly; it also explains the forms mentioned above (p. 198, 20).—III. The Syriac forms are instructive. *No choice allowed as in the first class!*—IV. The form חֲכַכְבָּרָא is certainly a possible form, though the one given in the table seems to have been preferred on account of its greater ease.

FOURTH CLASS: $c v c \bar{v} c$:

I.	חֲכָר	שִׁלָּם	אֲרָרָא	
II.	חֲכָרָא	יִקְרָא	עֲמִיקָא	עֲמִיקָא
III.	חֲכַכְבָּר	שִׁלְמִכּוֹן	שִׁלְמִכּוֹן	עֲבִידָא
IV.	חֲכַכְבָּרָא			

NOTES.—I. The long vowel draws everywhere the accent upon itself (Accent Rule II.).—III. Contrast שְׁלֵמִיכֹן with עִבְרִיתָא and observe how the latter could readily pass into עִבְרִיתָא, *i. e.*, a form analogous to הַעֲבָדָה (First Class, III.).—IV. חַמְמַחֲכִי is on a line with חַמְמַחֲכִי, עִבְרִיתָא. חַמְמַחֲכִי would be the correct form. The last two observations apply also to nouns of the second class.

The PLURILITERALS follow the principles laid down for the bi- and trilaterals. It all depends on the quantity of the last vowel. The following table may serve as an illustration:

I.	פִּרְזֹל	מַכְמַחֲכִי	
II.	פִּרְזֹלָה	מַכְמַחֲכִי	מַנְמַחֲכִי
III.	מַנְמַחֲכִי	נְבִירִיתָא	עִסְסִיסָא
IV.	אֶמְכַחֲסִי		

It remains to be said that the preceding classification has no reference to the formation or derivation of the nouns to be inflected. For purposes of inflection, יוֹם and בֵּית are biliterals (type *b*), נֶפֶשׁ and עֵץ equally biliterals (type *c*); בֵּיתָא, מַמְכָּא, מַנְמַחֲכִי belong to the first class of trilaterals, מַחְמַחֲכִי to the third and מִדְרָא to the fourth, while מִשְׁכָּן, מַעֲבָד, נְדִיבָא, etc., are regarded as quadrilaterals.

Roots with a semivowel as third radical require a few additional remarks.

FIRST CLASS.—To חַמְמַחֲכִי correspond forms like חַמְמַחֲכִי Dan. 2:19, חַמְמַחֲכִי Dalman, 109, חַמְמַחֲכִי *ibid.*, חַמְמַחֲכִי Noeldeke, 85, etc.; to הַעֲבָדָה — חַמְמַחֲכִי Dan. 4:11, חַמְמַחֲכִי Dalman, *ibid.*, חַמְמַחֲכִי Noeldeke, 61; to חַמְמַחֲכִי — חַמְמַחֲכִי = rīnīṭā, חַמְמַחֲכִי Noeldeke, 26, and, owing to the long vowel which draws the accent upon itself, חַמְמַחֲכִי *ibid.* 61. As חַמְמַחֲכִי is the prototype of חַמְמַחֲכִי Dalman, *ibid.*, so does חַמְמַחֲכִי, *i. e.*, חַמְמַחֲכִי, presuppose *חַמְמַחֲכִי. חַמְמַחֲכִי and חַמְמַחֲכִי are perfectly analogous to חַמְמַחֲכִי and חַמְמַחֲכִי in their origin. חַמְמַחֲכִי corresponds to חַמְמַחֲכִי. Cf. also חַמְמַחֲכִי with חַמְמַחֲכִי; חַמְמַחֲכִי for *חַמְמַחֲכִי, cf. חַמְמַחֲכִי, is formed by analogy from חַמְמַחֲכִי, hence also חַמְמַחֲכִי for *חַמְמַחֲכִי, cf. חַמְמַחֲכִי, Dalman, 110.

3. *must remain*, if the preceding syllable end in a long vowel and the next following vowel lack stress; so also in the construct state irrespective of the quantity of the preceding vowel.—The following are (a) *necessary*, (b) *possible* Early Aramaic forms:

(b) α . אֶמְתָּחֹן || אֶמְתָּחֹן || נִשְׁמָתְחֹן || נִשְׁמָתְחֹן || יִלְדָּתְחֹן || יִלְדָּתְחֹן
 β . אֶמְתָּא , נִשְׁמָתָא , יִלְדָּתָא
 [α . שְׁעָתְחֹן , β . שְׁעָתָא].

The result of our investigation goes to show that the Aramaic feminine ending as taken over from Semitic speech was *AT*, the vowel being occasionally reduced in accordance with the laws of Early Aramaic accentuation, and eventually allowed to disappear entirely, provided no phonetic difficulty stood in the way, and even then not necessarily. There is no trace in Aramaic of a consonantal feminine termination *T*.

Forms like נְשֻׁמְתָּ || נְשֻׁמְתָּ on the one hand, and יִלְדְתָּ, פְּהֻמְתָּ on the other correspond to Hebrew שִׁבְלִיתָ, מְמַלְכְתָּ, אִילִיתָ, יִלְדְתָּ, צִדְקָתָּ || נְשֻׁמְתָּ is a *possible*, מְמַלְכְתָּ a *necessary* form. For נְשֻׁמְתָּ by the side of the former is certainly a possible form; while *מְמַלְכְתָּ is unpronounceable. In Aramaic we are able to

state with precision *when* and *why* forms like מִמְלַכְתִּי become necessary. In all forms with the syllable next to the one preceding the vowel of the feminine ending being open with a long vowel or closed with a short vowel, and the *τ* followed by a stressed vowel (in an open suffix *e. g.*), the last stem-vowel *must* be retained. The reason is obvious: a syllable of the kind just mentioned—*c* *ṽ*, *c* *v* *c*—has no room for another consonant; and since the *א* of the ending, immediately preceding the stressed syllable, must, in accordance with the laws of Early Aramaic accentuation, be reduced, the preceding stem-vowel, in accordance with the same laws, must remain. Remove one of the two conditions, and the obligation will cease: נִשְׁמַחָא and יִלְחָכוּן are *possible*, not *necessary* forms. Lengthen the vowel of the feminine ending (in the plural), and you are again limited to one form (with the second vowel of the stem reduced irrespective of the character of the first syllable): נִשְׁמַחִי, יִלְחָדִי are *necessary* forms.

The problem propounded above (p. 197) finds an adequate solution on Aramaic ground, ultimately in the laws of Early Aramaic accentuation. The presumption forces itself upon us that the Hebrew phenomenon will have to be understood as the resultant of the identical factors. It is with the aid of the Aramaic that we are led to an observation which an induction of all examples verifies, that the necessary retention of the second stem-vowel in nouns like מִמְלַכְתִּי, etc., is bound up with the character of the first syllable (*c* *ṽ* or *c* *v* *c*). So far Hebrew agrees with Aramaic (as it also does in the plural, *cf.* מִמְלַכְתִּי || מִמְלָכְתִּי). This necessity is unintelligible on Hebrew inflectional grounds. *מִמְלַכְתִּי (sing.) is certainly pronounceable. Whence the necessity of saying in Hebrew מִמְלַכְתִּי, and nothing but מִמְלַכְתִּי? We answer: The proper form corresponding to עֲטַרְתִּי in Hebrew also is not עֲטַרְתִּי (*cf.* צִדְקָתִי), but עֲטַרְתִּי (*i. e.*, צִדְקָתִי); hence מִמְלַכְתִּי the only possible form, for *מִמְלַכְתִּי was out of question and *מִמְלַכְתִּי unpronounceable.

Have we more than presumptive grounds for this statement of ours which will seem rather startling to many a Hebraist? Yes, we have.

THE ARAMAIC METHOD IN HEBREW NOMINAL INFLECTION.

A superficial glance at the Hebrew method of nominal inflection will bring to light two distinct methods. To take one of the most prominent distinctive features, some Hebrew nouns have a separate form for the absolute state, while others have not and use their construct state form also for the absolute; *cf. e. g.* לֵבָב *abs.* and לֵבָב *ctr.* דָּבַשׁ *abs.* and דָּבַשׁ *ctr.*. Let us agree to call the latter method the Aramaic one (in the same sense as we call verbal forms like יָסַב 1 Sam. 17:30, וַיֵּסֶב Ex. 13:18, וַיִּנָּחֵם Deut. 1:44, תִּנְחָמוּ Job 19:2, הִמְכֹּר *ibid.* 24:24, נִחַלְתָּ Ezek. 22:16 over against יָסַב, נִחַלְתָּ, הִמְכֹּר, [נָקַר + יָם = נָקִים *cf.* תִּנְחָמוּ, וַיִּנָּחֵם, וַיֵּסֶב, יָסַב, תִּנְחָמוּ, etc., Aramaic); *cf.* our remarks above (p. 198, 22). Does this lack of a separate absolute state form constitute the only feature of the Aramaic method? Let us inflect לֵבָב on the one hand and דָּבַשׁ on the other.

abs.	לֵבָב	דָּבַשׁ
ctr.	לֵבָב	דָּבַשׁ
	לֵבָבִי	דָּבַשִּׁי
	לֵבָבְךָ	דָּבַשְׁךָ or דָּבַשְׁךָ
	לֵבָבְכֶם	דָּבַשְׁכֶּם or דָּבַשְׁכֶּם

NOTES.—1. In דָּבַשִּׁי the first syllable is *loosely* closed, *cf.* בִּשְׂבָכָה Gen. 19:33, צִלְלוֹ Jer. 6:4 [which otherwise would be pronounced and written צִלְוֹ], though occasionally it may be *firmly* closed [*cf.* בִּרְכָה *ctr.* בִּרְכַּתִּי but בִּרְכַּתִּי *ctr.* חֲרִידָה *ctr.* חֲרִידַתִּי]: 2 Chron. 26:19.—2. The — after the first radical becomes — after a guttural: לִחְנֹנֶה Ps. 102:14, בִּהְטָאָה Num. 15:28, *cf.* סָפַר but חָלַק, חָלְקִי [so also after the palatal (semi-guttural) גַּ Job 20:7]; before a guttural we find in its place — (where it may be disputed whether we have before us an actual phonetic change or else the guttural *preserves* an original א; qatal and qital were old parallels, and it is perfectly possible that the latter represents a deflection from the former): וּבִזְעָפוֹ Isa. 9:6, *cf.* in the verb קָרַב Lev. 9:7, קָרְבִּי *ibid.* 10:4, but שָׁהַט * [imperf. יִשְׁהַט *ibid.* 4:33], שָׁהַטוּ Ex.

12:21 (this is the rule, although occasionally we meet with שָׁחַד Job 6:22), also Arab. يَفْتَحُ — فَتَحَ , يَبْرَأُ imperf. بَرَأَ (Vernier, I., § 146, 2). Hence בָּעֵר Lam. 3:7 and שָׁעַר Cant. 4:1 belong to בָּעֵר Gen. 26:8 and שָׁעַר 2 Sam. 14:26, in spite of בָּעֵר Cant. 4:1 and שָׁעַר Isa. 7:20, in spite also of Arab. شَعَرٌ .—3. דָּבַשָּׁה , cf. בָּצַעְדָּה Judg. 5:4, רָקַעַה Ezek. 35:6 (Lagarde, *loc. cit.* 142:8, rightly compares imperf. رَكَع *ibid.* 6:11; he should, however, have used the term فَعَّلٌ , *ibid.* 1, with the limitation set forth above note 2: ק is a semi-guttural, בָּקַעַם Am. 1:13 notwithstanding). For דָּבַשָּׁה I have no example; I infer it for the present from דָּבַשְׁתֶּם , cf. note 4 (the קָטַל forms will offer us later on a more complete analogy).—4. For דָּבַשְׁתֶּם I have no example; cf. דָּבַשְׁתֶּם לְהַנִּיחֵם Isa. 30:18. In לָבַב and לָבַבְתֶּם the two systems meet. I look upon לָבַבְתֶּם as an Aramaic form. In לָבַב we have a special case of the working of the principle to which we owe לָבַבְתֶּם (cf. above, p. 208, 7).—5. זָעַרְךָ and זָעַפְךָ show total loss of the second stem-vowel; i. e., we obtain forms analogous to مَدَفَعٌ , مَدَفَعٌ ; thus the transition into the “segolate” class is effected (cf. above, p. 207 sq.); the next step is בָּעֵרְךָ Lev. 9:7, i. e., to use a term from Syriac grammar, a form with the مَحْمَلٌ (p. 207, 25), of which בָּעֵר is a direct descendant. Similarly we obtain זָעַר Prov. 19:12, זָעַר *ibid.* 30:29, שָׁעַר Isa. 7:20. (Note also the differentiation in meaning: זָעַר = *stepping* [infin.], זָעַר = *step*).—6. From צָלַל to $\text{צָלַ$ Hos. 14:8 there is but one step—the *loosely* closed syllable is *firmly* closed (we may presume, this transition took place first before הָ and כֶּם and was thence transferred to other forms), which ultimately resulted in צָל ; similarly הִנָּה gave rise to הָן , הִטָּהָה [from * הִטָּא] to הִטָּא . We have now sufficient ground to assume that לָבַי through לָבַיִר goes back to לָבַב , i. e., לָבַב inflected according to the Aramaic method. Similarly דָּבַשָּׁה would have paved the way for * דָּבַש = Arab. دَبَسَ , just as from זָעַרְךָ [= * זָעַרְךָ] we actually have זָעַר (above, note 5). צָלַע 2 Sam. 16:13 [with which goes צָלַע and $\text{חָלַ$, ضَلَعٌ] and צָלַע Ex. 36:31 are descendants of * צָלַע [= Aram. צָלַע], i. e., the Aramaically inflected צָלַע forms

are but sparsely represented in actual Hebrew; still the list may be considerably increased by the aid of derivatives, and at the same time their transition into קָטַל and קָטַל forms may be witnessed. זָכָר by the side of זָכַר points the way. זָכָר and its companions of the type קָטַל (Lagarde, *loc. cit.* 199–202) presuppose *זָכַר, etc. The cstr. state זָכָר is analogous to the Aramaic forms of the type מָכַל (*ibid.* 198). Hebrew יָחַד Eccl. 1:3, חָסָד [later Hebrew traditionally חֶסֶד], חֶשֶׁב *ibid.* 7:25 are again instances of the Aramaic method. זָכַר has זָכַר, זָכַר by its side, חָסָד—חָסָר Prov. 10:21, חָסָר *ibid.* 28:22, חֶשֶׁב—חָשַׁב Ex. 28:8, פָּתַח—פָּתַחוֹךְ Ps. 119:130, שָׁבַר—שָׁבָר Am. 6:6, חָמָה—the later Hebrew חָמָה = the disfigured חִמָּה. Thus we obtain the parallels *זָכַר, *חָסָר, *חֶשֶׁב, *פָּתַח, *שָׁבַר, *חָמָה and זָכַר, חָסָר, חֶשֶׁב, פָּתַח, שָׁבַר, חָמָה, the latter representing the דְּבַשׁ column of the text. Such parallels as חָלָה and חָלָה, Aramaic חָלָה and Hebr. חָלָה, Hebr. חָלָה and חָלָה, etc., become now intelligible.—7. The difference between the Hebrew and Aramaic methods is once more brought out in the absolute state of the feminine noun (there being no room for difference in the other forms). It is difficult to tell in Hebrew which original vowel the — in a form like צָדָה represents. But חָרָה points to the — in חָרָה standing for — . Hence לָבַב would form *לָבָה, which form we should have indeed inferred from לָבָב. But דְּבַשׁ forms דְּבָשָׁה, *cf.* לְרִבְעָה Lev. 20:16 (with the first syllable *loosely* closed, as we learn from the analogy of feminines from קָטַל nouns, *cf.* below; occasionally it will have been *firmly* closed, *cf.* חָרָה with חָרָה as the next possible form; *cf.* indeed לָפַתָּה Ezek. 16:30, si vera lectio). צָמָה Jer. 2:25 by the side of צָמָה Deut. 8:15 points to *צָמָה, *i. e.*, the Aramaically inflected *צָמָה. [*Cf.* שָׁעַר, שָׁעַר, שָׁעַר Judg. 20:16, שָׁעַר.] In the actual language we find צָמָה Isa. 41:17. Hence קָטַל and קָטַל nouns are from the very beginning parallel formations. Thus we find by the side of רָעָב cstr. רָעָב—רָעָב (it will be seen now that our suggestion above as to

the guttural *preserving* a preceding A is strikingly confirmed), alongside of עֲצָבוֹן—עֲצָב* (inferred from the pl. עֲצָבִים) and עֲצָב Prov. 10:22. Hence also the parallels זָכַר and זָכָר, סָחַר and סָחָר, פָּתַח and פָּתָח, שָׁבַר and שָׁבָר; hence צָדָק and צָדֵק and “all s. c. qatl nouns inflected like qitl nouns.” The “infinitive nouns” אֲהַבָּה opp. שִׁנְאַתָּה, דִּבְרָתָה, יִרְאָה, etc., presuppose *אֲהַב, *שִׁנְאָה, *דִּבְרָה, *יִרְאָה which ultimately go back to אָהַב, etc., from which they can descend only along Aramaic lines. By the side of דִּבְרָתָה cstr. דִּבְרָתָה—דִּבְרָתָה Job 41:14 is a Hebrew form, דִּבְרָתָה Jer. 31:12 its Aramaic deflection.—8. It has been observed and recognized both by Lagarde (*loc. cit.* 142, 20 sqq.) and Barth (*loc. cit.* 105 sqq.) that קָטַל nouns are the *proper* (so correctly Barth) infinitives of קָטַל verbs. Both fail to see that הִפְעֵץ, *e. g.*, goes back through *הִפְעֵץ, *הִפְעָץ to *הִפְעָץ. I for one could never understand how an infinitive (*i. e.*, an abstract noun) could be derived formally from the perfect tense (*i. e.*, the participial form of the verb, the mode of actuality). To my mind infinitive nouns went most naturally with the imperfect tense as the mode of potentiality or abstraction. Nor could I become a convert to the belief in migration (metathesis) of vowels. Nouns of the type הִפְעָץ have no *formative* origin; they are created within the inflection of הִפְעֵץ nouns (twin-brothers of הִפְעָץ nouns), not according to the Hebrew method to be sure, but along the lines of the Aramaic system, the existence of which in Hebrew is not merely represented by the second column in the text, but also traceable within the first, as it has been shown, I think conclusively, in the foregoing notes.—9. I am inclined to consider קָטַל and קָטַל—فَعَال and فَعَال—nouns as parents of קָטַל and קָטַל. The s. c. infinitive absolute קָטַל is brought together by Barth (*loc. cit.* 57 sqq.) with the perf. of קָטַל verbs; its formation from other than קָטַל verbs is explained as due to analogy. It seems to me that the reverse is just as likely. קָטַל and קָטַל infinitives properly belong to those verbs the second vowel in the imperfect tense-stem of which is A (orig. Ā?). The deflection of קָטַל and קָטַל to קָטַל and קָטַל may have first

taken place in קָטְלִים, קָטְלָה, קָטְלוּ, מִקְטָל forms where the formative element seemed to make the long vowel superfluous (*cf.* Barth's principle of compensation, p. xiii *sq.*). קָטְלָה = qa(or qi)tālat (the accent remains, of course, where it originally was, qa(or qi)tālāt, with a slight accent on the ultima) is consequently older than קָטְלָה = qā(or qi)talāt, and we thus learn to appreciate the Hebrew method of inflection as older than the Aramaic system, though we admit that the latter plays a very important part in the present Hebrew system. A conglomeration of forms like עָשׂוּר, עָשָׂרָה, עָשָׂר, עָשֶׂר — עֲשׂוּרֹן [= עָשָׂר + וֹן], עֲשׂוּרִים, עֲשָׂרִים, עֲשָׂרָה becomes now perfectly intelligible. The genealogy of a חֲפֶץ form may be traced as follows: חֲפֶץ = חֲפֶץ = חֲפֶץ = חֲפֶץ = חֲפֶץ = חֲפֶץ. — 10. It seems to me that qitāl and qutāl were both parallels of qatāl differentiated for qatil and qatul verbs. Qutāl was deflected to qutal and subsequently along the lines of the Aramaic method to qutl. Hence טָהָרַי Ps. 89:45 (abs. טָהָר, *cf.* פָּתַח, or טָהָר, *cf.* דָּבַר? The answer is immaterial for our purposes and from our point of view. The ׀ under the ט does not help one way or the other. Note by the way that the proper vocalization of טָהָרוֹת[סָר] is טָהָרוֹת and that it should be transcribed accordingly) and טָהָרָה, טָהָר; hence also such combinations as נָכַר and נָכַר, *i. e.*, the verb existed both as נָכַר and נָכַר, just as טָמְאָה by the side of טָמֵא points to טָמֵא. [It is hardly necessary for me to say that it is not my opinion that *all* qitl nouns go back to qital and not say qitil, or *all* qutl forms to qutal and not *e. g.* qutul; *cf.* indeed our remarks further on; in any case it has been shown that Hebrew nouns of the type קָטַל go back to fuller (dissyllabic) formations, and that they do so only within the Aramaic system.]

The חֲבֶשׂ column, it will be seen now, represents the Aramaic inflection not mainly and exclusively in the lack of a distinct absol. state form, but throughout, in all its essential features which, as was demonstrated above, are rooted in the laws of Early Aramaic accentuation. Moreover, the לָכַב column itself contains encroachments on the part of the Aramaic method.

The inflection of קטל nouns is another instance of the prevalence of the Aramaic method in Hebrew, and proceeds along the same lines as the חבש inflection.

abs. קטל
 cstr. קטל
 קטלי
 קטלה or קטלה
 קטלכם or קטלכם

NOTES.—1. קטל is the ordinary form of the s. c. “infinitive construct.”—2. קטלי, cf. רדפי Ps. 38:21, hence with the first syllable *loosely* closed; but cf. the occasional form הפני Gen. 19:21.—3. קטלה, cf. אספה Ex. 23:16; קטלה, cf. לרדפה 1 Sam. 25:29.—4. קטלכם, cf. עברכם Josh. 4:23; קטלכם, cf. מרדכם *ibid.* 22:16.—5. אספה and הפני are “segolate” forms; the next step is מאסכם Isa. 30:12, קרבכם Deut. 20:3, *i. e.*, with the חֲמֻץ; in אסה Isa. 32:10 the development into a “segolate” is completed.—6. The feminine of קטל is קטלה, cf. לקרבה Ex. 36:2.—7. The Hebrew inflection seems to be entirely wanting, unless we interpret קטני 2 Chron. 10:10 in the light of אדמה fem. of אדם; the fem. גדלה would be the Hebrew counterpart of the Aramaic קרבה, if the — in גדלה could with certainty be said to stand for *u*.—8. קטל, *i. e.*, qutul, may be a deflection of qutūl || qatūl = the infinitive of imperff. in *u* (ū ?); cf. Barth, *loc. cit.*, 126 sqq.

Another example of the Aramaic method in Hebrew is offered by those nouns of the קטל class which go back to קטל forms. After Lagarde's lucid treatment of the subject (*loc. cit.* 71 sqq.), we may take the fact for granted, and content ourselves with showing how it is only through our discovery of the Aramaic vein in the inflection of the Hebrew noun that the process becomes intelligible. Lagarde argues thus: בדר has for its construct state בדרה—כתף ברה—רה—ורק ירה, בדר מלה was originally the cstr. st. of מלה = מלה and subsequently came to be used also in the absol. state. So far everything is clear and true. But I ask myself—and so will many a reader of Lagarde's

abs. דֶּפֶר
 estr. דֶּפֶר
 דֶּפֶר cf. תְּהִלָּם Gen. 11:6.
 תְּפִירָם.

abs. הָפֵר
 cstr. הָפֵר *cf.* עֶקֶב Gen. 25:26
 or הָפֵר *cf.* זָקֵן Gen. 24:2
 הָפֵר *cf.* כְּתָפֵי
 הַפְּרִיכִים *cf.* הַפְּרִיכִים = הַפְּרִיכִים or הַפְּרִיכִים = הַפְּרִיכִים

Lastly he will be instructed to deflect הִפֵּר after the analogy of דִּבֵּשׁ, allowing, however, the — after the ה (the parent-vowel of the — in הִפֵּר) to remain throughout unchanged. If I am asked why, I will say *cf.* חִבְרִי Isa. 1:23, cstr. of חִבְרִים, but זִקְנֵי cstr. of זִקְנִים (*i. e.*, the guttural preserves an original א).

cstr. הִפֵּר
 הִפְרִי
 הִפְרָה or הִפְרָה
 הִפְרָם or הִפְרָם.

I go on to tell the class that חִבְרִי would be inflected in Aramaic regularly after the fashion of הִפֵּר: חִבְרִי, חִבְרִי, חִבְרָם and point out how from חִבְרָם we could easily obtain חִבְרִי, just as from מִלְכָּם we have מִלְכָּה, hence from הִפְרָם — *הִפְרִי, and that if they now said הִפְרָם “came from” הִפֵּר, I had no objection. *Cf.* indeed the traditional עֵין הָרָה Berākōt 2b = ܥܝܢ ܗܪܗ = ῥιπὴ ὀφθαλμοῦ 1 Cor. 15:52, and הִנֵּן הַחֲמָה Ber. 9b, הִנֵּה, Rōš haššānā 4:2 for הִנֵּן, הִנֵּן and הִנֵּה, the last two being forms from ע”ר roots. Similarly I explain מָכַס Num. 31:37 with its fem. cstr. st. מִכְסַּת Ex. 12:4, מָמַר Prov. 17:25 and תָּבַל Lev. 20:12 as Aramaic deflections from *מָכַס, *מָמַר, *תָּבַל.

The following observations will, I think, more fully substantiate our assumption in Hebrew of the Aramaic inflection of חִבְרִי nouns. The דָּבַר and עוֹלָם — qatal and qātal — nouns show a complete analogy with reference to one another in their inflection in Hebrew. *Cf.*

abs.	דָּבַר	עוֹלָם
cstr.	דְּבַר	עוֹלָם
	דְּבָרִי	עוֹלָמִי
	דְּבָרְךָ	עוֹלָמְךָ
	דְּבָרָם	עוֹלָמָם
	דְּבָרֵי, דְּבָרֶיךָ	עוֹלָמֵי, עוֹלָמֶיךָ
	דְּבָרֵי (כֶּם)	עוֹלָמֵי (כֶּם)

But the **חֵבֶר** and **שֵׁפֶט**—qatil and qātil—nouns as a rule do not:

abs.	חֵבֶר	שֵׁפֶט
cstr.	חֵבֶרִי	שֵׁפֶטִי
	חֵבְרִי	שֵׁפֶטִי
	חֵבְרָה	שֵׁפֶטָה
	חֵבְרָכֶם	שֵׁפֶטְכֶם
	חֵבְרִי, חֵבְרִים	שֵׁפֶטִי, שֵׁפֶטִים
	חֵבְרִי(כֶּם)	שֵׁפֶטִי(כֶּם)

The lack of analogy is felt in **חֵבְרִי, חֵבְרָה, חֵבְרִים** contrasted with **שֵׁפֶטִי, שֵׁפֶטָה, שֵׁפֶטִים**; in **חֵבְרָה** compared with **שֵׁפֶטָה**. The **שֵׁפֶט** column is thoroughly Aramaic (*cf.* above, p. 208). Occasional forms like **שׁוּמְמָה** 2 Sam. 13:20, **שׁוּמְמִים** Lam. 1:16 are on a line with **עֹלְמִי, עֹלְמִים**, *i. e.*, remnants of the Hebrew inflection (as over against the Aramaic, *cf.* **יְהֻדִין, יְהֻדִי**). **חֵבְרִי, חֵבְרָה, חֵבְרִים** correspond to **יְהֻדִי, יְהֻדָּה, יְהֻדִים**; *i. e.*, the **חֵבֶר** column is in its greater part Hebrew. Hence the dissonance. As **שׁוּמְמִים, שׁוּמְמָה** are Hebrew forms compared with **שֵׁפֶטִים, שֵׁפֶטָה**, so are **מְלָכִי** (inferred from **מְלָכִי**) forms Aramaic compared with **חֵבְרִי**. Aramaic **כְּתָבִי, כְּתָבִי** differ only in the quantity of the first vowel; so do Hebrew **כְּתָבִי, כְּתָבִי** (= **כְּתָבִי** from which **כְּתָבִי**).

Coming back to our statement (above, p. 213), we may assert without fear of contradiction on the basis of the foregoing illustrations that the Aramaic method of nominal inflection as described above (p. 198 *sqq.*) and as traced there (p. 202) to its origin in the laws of Early Aramaic accentuation, largely permeates our Hebrew nominal inflection and goes side by side with another method which we may call the Hebrew proper. Hence, if we find that a problem as the one stated at the head of this paper and reiterated on p. 212 cannot be answered on Hebrew ground, but is fully solved in Aramaic, we are justified in seeing in this fact another instance of the prevalence of the Aramaic method of inflection in Hebrew. In truth, **עֲצָרָה, מְלָכָה, חֲמִשָּׁת, חֲמִשָּׁת, קֹדֶשׁ, יְבִשָּׁת, סֶפֶר** nouns *must* owe their origin to one and

the same principle; and since, I think, it has been shown conclusively that the s. c. "segolate" nouns are not independent formations, but represent "deflections" (the term, I hope, will not be found inappropriate) from dissyllabic formations inflected according to the Aramaic method (which latter is based on a few simple accentual principles), so will the עֲצָרָה etc. nouns, instead of being regarded as parallel formations with the "toneless and consonantal" ending *τ*, have to be understood as Aramaic deflections from nouns with the only original accented and vocalic termination: *AT*. There is no trace in Hebrew (as there is none in Aramaic, p. 211) of a consonantal termination *τ*. עֲצָרָה is a back formation from עֲצָרְהֶם through עֲצָרְהֶם (with the ^{וֹ}עֲצָרְהֶם), just as מִלְּךָ is formed backwards from מִלְּכֶם (above, p. 219 sq.); and just as מִלְּכֶם goes back to the Aramaically inflected *מִלְּךָ, so does עֲצָרְהֶם go back to the Aramaically inflected *עֲצָרָה. *מִלְּךָ and עֲצָרָה are proper Hebrew "formations"; מִלְּךָ and עֲצָרָה represent Aramaic "deflections" on Hebrew ground.

The only scholar of modern times who to my mind had an inkling of the real origin of the עֲצָרָה nouns in Hebrew was S. D. Luzzatto. His views on the subject I gather from a letter appended to the Vienna (1865) edition of the מַעֲשֵׂה אֵזֶר (= the same author's *Prolegomeni ad una grammatica ragionata della lingua Ebraica*, Padova, 1836, p. 124 sq.). He starts with the assertion (וְיִסּוּד הַיִּסּוּדוֹת בְּתַכְנִיט לְשׁוֹן הַקֹּדֶשׁ) that Hebrew and Aramaic at one time formed one language, and that of the two Aramaic preserved in its greater part the original form, while Hebrew underwent in course of time many changes. Hence it follows, he claims, that many phenomena in Hebrew can be explained adequately only from Aramaic. Among the various points which Luzzatto attempts to elucidate by the aid of Aramaic is found the following one touching our subject. He makes the observation that for the sake of euphony and vocalic richness (לְאַהֲבַת הַנְּעִימוֹת וְרִבּוֹי הַתְּנוּעוֹת), the Aramaic types גָּבַר, צָלַם, קָשַׁט are transformed in Hebrew into גָּבַר, צָלַם and קָשַׁט forms. He proceeds to explain as Aramaic forms some Hebrew anomalies and concludes by saying: בְּזֶה יִתְבָּאֵר גַּם-כֵּן מִהִיכָן בָּאָה לְקֶצֶת שְׁמוֹת: לְשׁוֹן נִקְבָּה שְׁתֵּי תַמּוּנוֹת, כְּגוֹן מִשְׁמָרָה מִשְׁמֶרֶת, מִלְּחָמָה מִלְּחָמָה,

מִלְאָכָה מִלְאָכָה, הִנֵּה הַסְּמִיכוֹת מִן־מִשְׁמֶרֶה הוּא מִשְׁמֶרֶת, וְאַחֵר
 כִּן הַחֲלִיפֵי מֶרֶת בְּמֶרֶת, עַל־דֶּרֶךְ שֶׁהַחֲלִיפֵי גֶבֶר בְּגֶבֶר, וְלִקְהוֹת כִּי
 מִשְׁמֶרֶת הִנֵּה מִתְחַלְתּוּ סְמוּךְ נִשְׁאֵר רֹב שְׁמוּשׁ מִשְׁמֶרֶת וְחִבְרִי
 בְּסְמִיכוֹת; אֲבָל הוּאִיל וּמִשְׁקַל פֶּעַל וְחִבְרִי הוּא שְׁוֹה לְסְמוּךְ וּלְנִפְרֵד,
 אָמְרוּ לַפְעָמִים גַּם לְנִפְרֵד מִשְׁמֶרֶת מִלְאָכָה מִלְחָמָה.

This statement, crude as it is, contains many germs of the true state of affairs. Luzzatto errs in ascribing an earlier date to the Aramaic decay of vowels from the point of view of Hebrew, not to say Semitic. His distrust of the use of Arabic for comparative purposes misleads him. He is also very mechanical about the "change" of גֶּבֶר into גֶּבֶר, מֶרֶת into מֶרֶת. He finds himself, however, on this point in good company. It was reserved for Lagarde (*loc. cit.* 73) to ridicule the idea of "qatl forms throwing their vowel forward behind the second radical" (*cf.* Stade's [*Grammatik*, 146] "Abart mit verrücktem Vocale"). The true interpretation has been given, I think, in the present paper; but the fact we find stated, somewhat awkwardly it may be granted, in the above remarks of the Italian scholar, and he shall receive his due credit for what he has seen.

It may not be out of place, simply by way of recapitulation, to follow out in the order adopted above (p. 198), for the Aramaic system of nominal inflection, the traces of that method in Hebrew, showing each time the place which the עֲצָרֹת forms occupy within the whole system.

BILITERALS.

I. <i>a.</i>	בֵּן	estr.	בֵּן, בֶּן	b.	קָם	estr.	קָם, קָם
II.	בְּנִי				קָמִי		
	*בְּנִה	estr.	*בְּנִת		קָמָה	estr.	קָמָה, קָמָה
III.	בְּנֵיכֶם,		בְּנִתִּי —		קָמְכֶם,		*קָמְתִי — קָמְתִי
IV.	*בְּנִתְכֶם		— בְּנִתְכֶם				קָמְתֶכֶם — קָמְתֶכֶם
		I. <i>c.</i>	לֵב, לֵב	estr.	לֵב, לֵב		
		II.	לֵבִי				
			אִשָּׁה	estr.	אִשָּׁה, אִשָּׁה		
		III.	לִבְכֶם,		אִשְׁתִּי — אִשְׁתִּי*		אִשְׁתִּי — אִשְׁתִּי
		IV.			אִשְׁתְּכֶם — אִשְׁתְּכֶם		

NOTE.—*קָחַת* forms are still found in Hebrew, *cf.* *מִצְבַּח* 2 Kgs. 10:27 || *מִצְבֹּת* Gen. 35:14, *הוֹצֵבֶת* Deut. 25:16, *מִתַּחַת* *ibid.* 16:17 || *מִתַּח* Prov. 25:14.

FOURTH CLASS:

- I. *גְּבִיר*, *גְּבִירָה*
 II. *גְּבִירָה*
גְּבִירָה *est.* *גְּבִירָה*
 III. *גְּבִירָתְכֶם* *גְּבִירָתְךָ* = **גְּבִירָתְךָ* = *גְּבִירָתְךָ* *גְּבִירָתְכֶם* or *גְּבִירָתְכֶם*
 IV. *גְּבִירָתְכֶם* = *גְּבִירָתְכֶם* = *גְּבִירָתְכֶם*

NOTES.—1. It may be disputed whether *גְּבִירָה* is a direct descendant of *גְּבִיר*, *גְּבִירָה*, or else comes from *גְּבִיר* = **גְּבִיר* or **גְּבִירָה*. The same question may be asked concerning the feminine forms of the type *עֲנֻפָּה* (First Class): they may be direct descendants of *עֲנֻפָּה* = 'anāp forms (*cf.* above, p. 216). *עֲבֹד* || *עֲבֹדָה* could form a double feminine: *עֲבֹדָה* = *عَبَادَة* and *עֲבֹדָה* *cf.* *בִּקְרָה*, *הַצֵּלָה* || *בִּקְרָה* (according to Barth, *cf.* above, p. 217, 3). As *עֲבֹדָה* would be deflected to *עֲבֹדָה*, so *עֲבֹדָה* to *עֲבֹדָה*, *cf.* *נִפְרָה* = *نَفَرَة*. Hence *שִׁכְבָּה* = **שִׁכְבָּה* fem. of *שָׁכַב*, *שָׁכַב* from which we have *שָׁכַב*, as *קָטַח* is actually found by the side of *קָטוּרָה* Deut. 33:10. I have a right to draw *יְבוּשָׁה* to *יָבוֹשׁ*, *יָכֹל* to *יָכֹל*, and it depends entirely on my general feeling how far I shall make use of it. Some *קָטַח* forms certainly are to be drawn to *קָטוּרָה* nouns, *i.e.*, are feminines of *קָטוּל*, *קָטוּל*, the infinitive of *yaqtul*, *yuqtul* (*yaqtul?* *yuqtul?*); but others may come from *קָטוּלָה*, fem. of *קָטוּל*, the infinitive of *yaqtal* (*yaqtāl?*). *קָטַח* gave birth to *קָטַח*. Hence *קָטַח* forms in Hebrew are derivable from *קָטוּל* and *קָטוּל*.—2. In the same manner *קָטַח* may go back to *קָטַח*, the infinitive of *yaqtal* (*yaqtal*). But *זָאֵב* = *ذئب*, *בָּאֵר* = *بئر*, etc., compared with *זָאֵב* (certainly later than **זָאֵב* in *זָאֵב*), *זָאֵב* for *זָאֵב*, point to **זָאֵב*, **זָאֵב* (hence in the inflection *זָאֵבִים*, *זָאֵבִים*), *i.e.*, are properly *qitl*

nouns (cf. שְׁאַלְתָּ and שְׁאַלְתָּהּ = שְׁלַחְתָּ, cf. also לְאֹמֶר || בְּאֹמֶר), which may then be deflections from qital types. בָּאֵר, i. e., *בֶּאֵר, by the side of בֹּאֵר, רֹאשׁ [cf. רֹאשִׁית] by the side of רֹאשׁ = רֹאֵשׁ, point to בָּאֹר and רֹאֵשׁ as their common parent forms of which bi'ār, bu'ār and ri'āš were variants.—3. The preceding observations hold good with the Second Class: the traditional צִדְקָה (Levy, *Talmudwch.*, IV., 172) is an instance.

PLURILITERALS.

מִיִּנְקוֹת and מִיִּנְקָה, מִיִּנְקָה by the side of מִיִּנְקוֹת will serve as illustrations. A special table is hardly necessary.

ROOTS WITH A SEMIVOWEL AS THIRD RADICAL.

FIRST CLASS:

I. ?				דִּמְוִי	דִּמְוִי
II.			דִּמְוִי	דִּמְוִי	דִּמְוִי
			דִּמְוִי estr. דִּמְוִי	דִּמְוִי	דִּמְוִי
III. ?			דִּמְוִי = דִּמְוִי	דִּמְוִי (דִּמְוִי)	דִּמְוִי
			*דִּמְוִי = דִּמְוִי	דִּמְוִי (dimuwti)	דִּמְוִי
IV.	loosely closed	firmly closed	*דִּמְוִי = דִּמְוִי	דִּמְוִי	דִּמְוִי

NOTES.—1. It is not easy in each case to trace back the “segolates” of לְרִי roots to their exact dissyllabic prototypes. Still כִּסְרָה = כִּסְרָה and כִּסְרָה = kisāwuⁿ cannot be dissociated. A good many of the qatl, qitl, qutl nouns here also will represent deflections from qatāl, qitāl, qutāl types (infinitives). Nor have we a right to dissociate עֲנִיָּה = *עֲנִיָּה and עֲנִיָּה = ‘a(i)nāwat fem. of *עֲנִי (the references are Ps. 22: 25; 45:5 and Prov. 18:12). דִּמְוִי (with the first syllable loosely closed) we infer from עֲנִיָּה Ps. 18:36 (though the latter could be drawn to עֲנִיָּה; the parallel עֲנִיָּה 2 Sam. 22:36 needs no correction [against Stade-Siegfried]: it comes from *עֲנִי = ‘anawat, cf. אֲחֻת, אֲחֻתָּה, Aram. אֲחָת, Heb. קָצַת). The

next step would be דְּמוֹתֵכֶם with the first syllable *firmly* closed, necessary in דְּמוֹתִי; from דְּמוֹתֵכֶם we obtain דְּמוֹת, דְּמוֹה, דְּמוֹי || דְּמוֹה, דְּמוֹי; cf. indeed הָדוֹת, הָדוֹה, and for qatl nouns הָאָהָה, שָׁלֹהָ, שָׁלֹי. —2. דְּמוֹתִי gives rise to דְּמוֹה, cf. דְּמוֹה, *i. e.*, a form with the \bar{u} ; from דְּמוֹה we obtain through דְּמוֹה דְּמוֹה cf. שָׁהוּ, שָׁהוּ, תָּהוּ, just as from תָּאֲרֵכֶם (cf. תָּאֲרִי) = תָּאֲרֵכֶם we obtain תָּאֲרִי (; the form בְּמִצְאֵכֶם Gen. 32:20 is to be explained accordingly; מִצְאָה would yield מִצְאֵכֶם, מִצְאֵכֶם, מִצְאֵכֶם and finally מִצְאֵכֶם which latter virtually leads to *מִצְאָה). Still the long vowel will in course of time have drawn the accent upon itself; hence דְּמוֹת, דְּמוֹתֵכֶם, דְּמוֹי. Similarly שְׁבִיכֶם (cf. שְׁבִיךְ) is found by the side of שְׁבִיכֶם the parent form of שְׁבִי (cf. also פְּרִיָהּ to פְּרִי), and שְׁבִי, פְּרִי will go back to *שְׁבִיכֶם, *פְּרִיָהּ. So we have שְׁבִית and שְׁבִיָה.

FOURTH CLASS:

Hebrew עָשָׂה Job 41:25 corresponds to Arab. عَدُوٌّ. The phonetic change will first have occurred in *עֲשׂוֹכֶם = עֲשׂוֹכֶם (cf. עֲרִירִים from עִיר cf. عَدُوٌّ). The ketib forms עֲשׂוֹת 1 Sam. 25:18 and נִשְׁוֹת Isa. 3:16 are to be read עֲשׂוֹת and נִשְׁוֹת. To *עֲשׂוֹכֶם = עֲשׂוֹכֶם will have corresponded in the feminine *עֲשׂוֹתִי from which *עֲשׂוֹת || עֲשׂוֹת. Hence to נִקְיָה will have corresponded *נִקְיָה. In the plural, however, only one form was possible: עֲשׂוֹת, נִקְיָה. Hence, by false analogy, plurals of this type were subsequently formed of feminines in יָה and יָה, no matter whether the *u* or *i* vowel was original or else due to principles of euphony: צְבִיָה pl. of צְבִיָה = the deflected צְבִיָה. צְבִיָה is a later back formation. So is בְּכִיָה a back formation from בְּכִיָה plural of בְּכִיָה = the deflected בְּכִיָה cf. עֲטִיָה. In מְרִבִּית and all of its type it is difficult to tell whether the vowel is organic. תְּנִיָה stands for תְּנִיָה as קִים for קִים; its sing. was תְּנִיָה = תְּנִיָה inferred from Mishnic תְּנִיָה, the Syriac تَنْيَا notwithstanding (cf. יְרִיעָה and تَنْيَا; unless we take תְּנִיָה

forms as denominatives from participles = גַּל + וֹת, גַּל representing that part of the form to which suffixes are appended, cf. גַּלִּי = גַּל + י; but even then there is no reason why *הַמִּית should not have been in use by the side of הַמִּיתָ; at any rate the latter form was not recognized by the Masora).

הַמִּיתָ GEN. 1:26.

The forms of the type הַמִּיתָ Gen. 1:26 are of interest to the biblical critic. As is well known, Wellhausen (*Prolegomena*, ed. 3, 407) quotes the occurrence of הַמִּיתָ in Gen. 1:26 as an *additional* argument against the pre-exilic origin of the Sacerdotal Code. Lagarde (*loc. cit.* 147 *sqq.*), after giving the literature on the subject, points out that the author may have meant הַמִּיתָ, a good Hebrew word, and that, if we speak of Aramaic influence, we can only lay it at the door of the later punctuator. To this we would say that there is no reason why we should reject the punctuation in this particular instance, especially after the flattering opinion given by the same scholar (*ibid* 132, 5-7); though we admit that no argument as to the date of a biblical writing can be based with certainty on the *mere* punctuation of a word. Thus we cannot say with Wellhausen that הַמִּיתָ is an Aramaic loan-word, for the reason that the argument must be taken from the vocalization—הַמִּיתָ; on the other hand, it seems we must admit that הַמִּיתָ is a later misreading, due to Aramaic influence. But suppose we found a הַמִּיתָ form spelled defectively—הַמִּיתָ, would not this fact help Wellhausen? Unfortunately פָּרָה Ex. 8:19 is not certain consonantly. Suppose again we found it in the absol. state? Shall we read בָּרִית, a form analogous to הַמִּיתָ, wherever it occurs in the absol. state, *בָּרִית? בִּשְׁבִּית Num. 21:29, בִּשְׁבִּית? So it seems after all that, if הַמִּיתָ be Aramaic, the Aramaism will not be, as Lagarde expresses himself, of a *later* date. Still Wellhausen is not helped. For, as this paper I think has brought out conclusively, עֲצָרָה, מִיִּנְקָה are as much Aramaic as הַמִּיתָ and בָּרִית. The use of עֲצָרָה in the absol. state would preclude the reading *עֲצָרָה, and מִתָּה, מִתָּה, בָּת would show the prevalence of the Aramaic method of inflection in Hebrew already at the time when the consonantal text was fixed; the word שֶׁתָּה (= שֶׁתָּה)

on the Mēša' Stone, line 2, would prove it for the eighth century before our era. The linguistic argument is everywhere a two-edged sword. The merits of the Wellhausenian theory lie elsewhere: its best argument—the reconstructed history of Israel (*cf.* Kittel, I., 90).

NOTE.—The sporadic occurrence of the τ ending in Arabic (نَحَتْ, أُخْتُ, بِنْتُ) and its frequent use in Ethiopic (Dillmann, 219 *sqq.*) will have to be explained as due to the same processes which have been observed in Aramaic, *i. e.*, the method of Early Aramaic accentuation is Semitic. I leave it, however, to more competent scholars to decide this question.—I wish also to add that I have been able to use Dalman's excellent *Grammar of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic*, while revising this paper. Professor Koenig's *Lehrgebäude II.*, which reached me but lately, has, it seems, not rendered another revision of this paper necessary. The reader is referred especially to page 426. If the view expressed in the present Notes be correct, as the writer believes it is, Professor Koenig's observations under the letter α must be said to be inadequate. The book will recommend itself to biblical scholars as a welcome store-house of material, also on account of the thorough-going exegetical work underlying it; on the subject, however, with which we have been dealing here (and also on the cognate question of the origin of the "segolates"), the views expressed by the learned Professor (whose kind criticism of our first literary work we gratefully remember), it must be regretted, are untenable and represent the latest summary of the traditional doctrines the inadequacies of which it has been the aim of this paper to set forth.

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE,
April 8, 1895.